LEBELER ON CH II REPORT

Under Walker, p. 18, Liebeler was
L. 9/3/64 memo)
constant in his criticism, noting lack of footnotes. Although he has, as frequently noted such ~~[illegible]~~ omissions, I suggest this reflects a weakness he recognizes but didn't specify in this part of the report. He should know, for he is responsible for any voids in the evidence, having questioned Walker himself.

22 - 11 - isn't possible this was not a typo, ~~that~~ they had more ~~[illegible]~~ shooting than are recalled?

Compare his critical comments with the final Report. Even if there had been a disposition to heed him - and there was not - there was little time. The grammarian got [illegible] the language he complained of ~~[illegible]~~ remains. So it with footnotes & quotes.
They may have changed in the years since my familiar with them but government galleys used to run 2 1/2 to the page. Ordinarily they now run 2.

Liebeler's 9/6/64 Memo on Ch IV

Aside from what this lengthy critical analysis tells us of the authors + the design + intent of the Report, which is very much — it reads like much of the early critical writing. There is almost nothing that I did not independently comment on in Whitewash, and what is not there is in Whitewash II, written after I had begun to study what is in the Archives + not published in the 26 volumes.

In short, the defects of this draft — meaning the Report — are so obvious they will be detected on casual examination. More, they are fundamental.

Liebeler says "I believe" but adds "You do not convince me" or, perhaps, "You make me wonder if I'm wrong ~~the~~ to believe"

What he says is that even for a prosecution case, ~~if~~ unopposed, the case against Oswald falls of its own weight - is no case at all.

He has not fixed on trivialities. These are the core of the case.

Unless the defects he reported not can be remedied. This is indisputable proof of Commission's incompetence & the fact that it was framed – knowingly. He is specific in saying that the basic conclusions range from what he calls "blocking" to "lies". Most common description is "misrepresentation". As far as he goes, he is right. He doesn't go far enough, but he ~~proves~~ does prove that the staff knew in advance their conclusions were invalid or wrong. In short, this means ~~what~~ prior culpable knowledge – Liebeler's and the Commission staff's. Nonetheless they proceeded with and issued a Report they knew ~~to~~ was erroneous, that reached untenable conclusions, left the crime ~~[illegible]~~ unsolved.

This is infinitely more ~~damn~~ damning than external, ex post facto criticism. It is a self-denunciation, when Liebeler's subsequent conduct & statements are evaluated.

The essence of Liebeler's criticism of the Report is that

I) Oswald could not have committed the crime and

II) That the collateral case built to make it seem like it could have is spurious.

He shows

I He did not have the capability because
  a) He was a poor shot
  b) The best shots couldn't do what was attributed to Oswald
  c) The rifle prevented it anyway

II a) He was not at the scene of the crime
  b) He could not have been there
  c) The entire story connecting him with the rifle is unproven & proven to the contrary
    1) it was never shown to be in his possession
    2) he was never shown to have practised with it & the one attempt to show this is spurious
    3) The evidence used to show he

owned the rifle doesn't.

4) Frazier's testimony about the bag Oswald carried is correct & not in error as the Report claims, for the Report misrepresents the evidence proving it is correct — in short Oswald did not take that rifle into the building that morning

5) The fingerprint evidence about the rifle is dubious

6) The fingerprint evidence about the boxes is misrepresented, does not involve Oswald in the crime in any way &, in fact, it exculpates him! — for the ~~latest~~ freshest print is not less than a day old — and there are other & unidentified prints on these same boxes.

7) In crediting Vicki Adams ~~at~~ testimony he discredits that of Lovelady & Shelley

8) The questions he raises about Baker seeing Oswald & Truly not are right, as Sauvage & I clearly raised ~~them~~

Then, if he detects what I did about the "automatic ~~[illegible]~~ closure on the door & the other means of getting there, i.e., from the west Hall

9) He detects, as we have (but falls short of labelling it) ~~[illegible]~~ fabrication of incriminating evidence & of the hiding of the exculpatory

a) in the fingerprints & palmprint
b) descriptions of assassin & its source
c) The Walker shooting
d) Oswald's whereabouts
e) Where some of the witnesses were & when they were ~~the~~ there.

II) In a number of instances, he says or hints that the "evidence" does not have the meaning attributed to it that, where he thinks it might, has not ~~the~~ that meaning alone. A few of many that come to mind (without checking his text - after a hasty reading of it:

A) Light in Paine Garage

B- Prints - every where
C- Curtain rods
D- Ballistics - Walker
E- rifle - firing test
F- Where O. was at 12:30 11/22/63 & Baker reenactment.
G- Fibre evidence & testimony
H- Photographic identification of rifle by Oswalds (which he also misrepresents by alluding to but a single picture when there were two)
I If & when the Paines noticed the wrapped-up blanket in the garage & whether its presence (rifle's) could be [illegible] in [illegible] accounted for.
J On Oswald's need to use for curtain rods - and his plan for an apartment, which is not in the Report but is explicit in the testimony - [illegible] [illegible]
K - Frazier on how Oswald held the bag - he is confirmed, not disproved!
L Oswald's old prints on the cartons shows he did not move them "in connection with the assassination
M Employer testimony on where Oswald was & what was so not expressed.

N - The police radio logs
O - Markham & her credibility
P - Tippit - bullets ballistics, id ent. of cartridges
Q - The official story of Oswald's "flight" & capture.